UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,833	06/16/2006	David Durantel	P08599US00/BAS	3759
881 STITES & HAI	7590 05/27/201 RBISON PLLC	EXAMINER		
1199 NORTH I	FAIRFAX STREET		WOOLWINE, SAMUEL C	
SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1637	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/27/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/528,833	DURANTEL ET AL.
Examiner-indated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	SAMUEL C. WOOLWINE	1637
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>SAMUEL C. WOOLWINE</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>BILL SCHULMAN</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>13 May 2010</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 112, 2 nd paragraph rejetion, claim objections		
Claims discussed: 1-28, 37-78		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Samuel Woolwine/ Examiner, Art Unit 1637 (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the claim objections/rejections in the Office action of 05/11/2010. Examiner offered to proceed by Examiner's amendment if the language proposed by the Examiner in the 05/11/2010 OA was acceptable. Examiner proposed language for claims 3, 4 46 and 47 that was different than that proposed in OA 05/11/2010, specifically: "The method according to claim 2, wherein the continuous DNA sequence comprises from 5' to 3' nucleotides of an HBV genomic sequence corresponding to nucleotides 1818 to 1813 and 1814 to 1960 of GenBank sequence GI 13365548 when said HBV genomic sequence is aligned with said GenBank sequence." The Examiner also raise the issue, not addressed in the Office action, that reciting a GenBank sequence in a claim renders the sequence disclosed in the GenBank record "essential material", which cannot be incorporated by reference. The Examiner suggested that either those claims be cancelled (since the recitation of the specific primers used in claim 1 inherently results in the limitations recited in claims 3, 4, 46 and 47) or that the sequence disclosed in GenBank GI 13365548 be added to the Sequence Listing.